

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-34 are pending. Applicant has canceled claims 3 and 5 and amended claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 22, and 25.

#### **Interview**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration during the telephone interview of June 28, 2007. During that interview, applicant's representative described applicant's technology and how it differs from processing performed by advertisement placement services.

A search engine service, which is one example of an advertisement placement service, receives advertisement sets (containing a keyword, an advertisement, and a bid amount) from various advertisers. When the search engine receives a query, it identifies search results and advertisement sets submitted by different advertisers that match the query (e.g., advertisement set has the query as its keyword). The search engine service then selects the matching advertisement sets based at least in part on their bid amounts and places the advertisements of the selected advertisement sets (e.g., as "sponsored links" or "paid for search results") along with the search results of the query.

Applicant's technology, in contrast, provides a computer system that allows an advertiser to generate advertisement sets automatically, to calculate bid amounts based on profitability or some other financial measure, and then to select which advertisement sets are to be submitted to a search engine service. Some search engine services allow advertiser to submit only one advertisement set per keyword. Thus, an advertiser would not be able to submit an advertisement set with the keyword "Harry Potter" to advertise a certain book and another advertisement set with the keyword "Harry Potter" to advertise a certain DVD. Applicant's technology may select an advertisement set from multiple

advertisement sets that share the same keyword based, in part, on past successes of the advertisements.

### Section 112 Rejection

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 9 from which claims 17 and 18 depend to address the concern expressed in the Office Action.

### Section 102/103 Rejections

Claims 1-19 and 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Colace, and claims 20-21 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colace and Official Notice. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to help clarify the subject matter of the invention.

Colace describes a computer system that allows an advertiser to manually add search listings (e.g., search term (i.e., keyword), link, title, and bid amount)), which appears to be similar to what applicant refers to as an advertisement set. (Colace, Fig. 7.) The advertiser can then submit the added search listings to the search engine, which performs an editorial review before placing the search listing with search results. Colace's computer system also allows the advertiser to manage the search listings by, for example, grouping them into categories or editing multiple search listings as a group. (Colace, Abstract.)

Applicant's technology provides an alternative to Colace's manual process of adding and submitting search listings. Such a manual process is impractical for advertisers who want to place advertisements for thousands and tens of thousands of different keywords. Such a large number of keywords results from the wide range of queries users may submit to a search engine when searching for web pages of interest. For example, when searching for a web page for purchasing a DVD of a Harry Potter movie, a user might

submit many different queries, such as "Harry," "Harry Potter," "Harry Potter DVD," "Harry Potter movie," "Harry Potter books," "Goblet of Fire," "Potter Sorcerer's Stone," "Rowland Potter," and many others. It would be impractical for an advertiser, especially one who sells thousands of different products, to manually identify all such useful keywords and to manually add and submit search listings for the keywords.

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-8 recite "advertisement generators that automatically generate advertisement sets." Claims 9-21 "automatically generating advertisement sets that specify an advertisement, a keyword, and a bid amount." Claims 22-34 recite "automatically generating advertisement sets that specify an advertisement, a keyword, and an amount." Colace describes no means to automatically generate search listings. Rather, they are manually added by a person using the screen of Colace's Figure 7.

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-8 recite "an advertisement manager" that "selects advertisement sets for which no currently conflicting advertisement set is currently submitted." Claims 9-21 recite "selecting advertisement sets for submission to an advertisement placement service such that a selected advertisement set does not conflict with a currently submitted advertisement set." Consider also, different advertisement sets with the same keyword may be automatically generated by different advertisement generators, and in this way, the advertisement manager may select advertisement sets to avoid conflict. Colace does not teach or suggest selecting advertisement sets that do not conflict. It appears Colace does not even allow a user to add two search listings for the same keyword. Colace describes when adding a search listing to copy everything from another search listing except the search term. (Colace, 9:38-41.) Since Colace avoids conflicting advertisement sets, it has no need to decide which conflicting advertisement sets to select.

In addition, applicant respectfully disagrees with the position in taking official notice in the Office Action that it "is old and well known in the art of search engines to select advertisement [sic, advertisements] based on frequency of [sic, or] desirability of

keywords." Applicant requests clarification as to under what circumstances a search engine would select advertisements based on frequency of a keyword or desirability of a keyword.

Based upon these remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: 7/20/07

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant